IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT
THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI
WRIT PETITION NO : 3068 of 2005

Between:
Dondaparti Akkayyapalem Main Roads Buildings Owner's Welfare Association, 43-36-13, Dondaparti Junction, Visakhapatnam-16, Rep. by its President K.S. Murthy.

... PETITIONER

AND

The Commissioner, Visakhapatnam Muncipal Corporation, Visakhapatnam.

...RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ, Order or Direction, particularly a Writ in the nature of Mandamus, declaring the proposed action of the respondent in seeking to widen the Akkayyapalem Main Road without following the due process of law and the directions issued by this Hon'ble court in W.P.No. 9531/2003, dt: 14.10.2004 as illegal and unauthorized and further direct the respondent herein to follow the procedure prescribed under the provisions of Visakhapatnam Municipal Corporation Act and directions issued by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.No. 9531/2003, dt: 14.10.2004 before taking up the proposed widening of Dondaparti Akkayyapalem Main Road, Visakhapatnam.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.K.V.SUBRAMANYA NARASU

Counsel for the Respondent: MR.T.S.VENKATARAMANA

The Court at the stage of admission made the following:

ORDER:

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned standing counsel appearing for the respondent.

The petitioner seeks a Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the proceedings dated 04-01-2005 issued by the respondent seeking to hand over his site, affected in the road widening of Akkayapalem Main Road, which was situated at premises No.43-36-13, Dondaparti, Akkayapalem Main Road Division Nos.30, 31, 32 & 33 of Visakhapatnam, without following due process of law, as arbitrary and illegal.

It is represented by the learned counsel appearing for both parties that the issue involved in this writ petition is squarely covered by a decision of this Court in W.P. No. 21198 of 1997 and batch, dated 03.02.1998, wherein the Division Bench while considering an identical question, issued guidelines as under:

1) Where a property is required for public purpose viz., widening of roads or for any other purpose, the authorities straightaway cannot take law into their hands and jump into the premises, dispossess or evict the occupants or demolish the property.

2) If the authorities concerned want to take action for eviction/dispossession of the occupants or demolition, they shall issue 60 days' prior notice notifying as to the nature of the property, the property to whom it belongs and the proposed action calling for explanation/objections if any from the occupants. On receipt of such objections, if there is any objection as to the ownership of the property, the authorities should determine the extent of encroachment of unauthorized occupation and also determine whether the property in question belongs to Government/any other local self Government or authority or the occupants and pass appropriate orders within three months from the date of receipt of the objections, after affording an opportunity of

being heard to the occupants.

3) In case where demolition of private property has already been made, the authorities shall determine the damages on the basis of the assessment to be made by the Engineer of the Roads and Buildings Department and disburse the amount of damages quantified forthwith.

4) If the demolition is in respect of local bodies' Government property, the question of damages does not arise. In such an event, the occupant shall be entitled to remove the material used for the construction.

5) In case of demolition of private property, the authorities concerned shall determine the loss caused to the occupants on the basis of the assessment to be made by the Engineer of R & B Department and on such assessment of damages, the concerned authorities shall take appropriate steps to disburse the amount quantified forthwith.

6) If there is any claim for grant/assessment of the property, the concerned authorities shall consider the same in accordance with law taking into consideration the eligibility and the entitlement of occupants, after making enquiry and till such claim is decided, there shall be status-quo obtaining as on today regarding the structures.

The learned standing counsel appearing for the respondent does not dispute the above legal position.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent not to demolish the structures in question without following the guidelines issued by the Division Bench in the above writ petition. No order as to costs.

_____

G. ROHINI, J

Date: 21-02-2005.
LSK

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

To
1. The Commissioner, Visakhapatnam Municipal Corporation
Visakhapatnam.
2. Two C.D copies.